

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination.

Claims 2, 7, 11 and 15-19 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 2 and 7 are amended, claims 3, 10, 12, 13 and 14 are canceled, and claims 16-19 are added. No new matter is added.

Claims 2, 3, 7 and 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,496,859 to Roy et al. ("Roy") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,801,949 to Bruck et al. ("Bruck") and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,118,771 to Tajika et al. ("Tajika"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The applied references fail to suggest an IP address setting system where "each node [has] a storing unit that prestores a particular multicast address, each node providing notification that the node is a member of the particular multicast address," as recited in claim 2.

The Office Action cites Tajika for allegedly teaching a system where "terminals belonging to a specific group have the same multicasting address, which is used to transfer data to all terminals in that specific group." See Office Action at page 3. However, Tajika fails to disclose or suggest an IP address setting device that transmits a request packet to a particular multicast address, where the particular multicast address is prestored in the storing unit of each node, i.e., prestored before the request packet is sent by the IP address setting device.

Independent claim 7 recites similar features to those referred to in connection with claim 2, above. Thus, for at least this reason claims 2 and 7 are patentable over the applied references.

Claims 11 and 15-19 depend from one of independent claims 2 and 7 and are therefore also patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons enumerated above, as well as for the additional features they recite.

For example, new claims 16 and 17 recite that the node response is transmitted to the particular multicast address to which the request packet transmitting unit transmits the request packet. This feature is not disclosed or suggested in the applied references. For example, conventionally, a response packet is transmitting using unicast. Unicasting requires a gateway to transmit a response. Thus, unicasting a response causes problems for nodes that do not have an address set because a default gateway also has not been set at that node. In contrast, transmitting a response packet using multicast techniques does not require that the default gateway has been set at the node, and accordingly a response may be sent for such nodes using multicasting. Thus, for at least these reasons claims 16 and 17 are patentable over the applied references.

New claims 18 and 19 are also believed patentable because the applied references do not disclose or suggest that the particular multicast address is prestored in the prior to being included as a node on the network, e.g., prestored during manufacture.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 2, 7, 11 and 15-19 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Aaron L. Webb
Registration No. 56,930

JAO:ALW/axl

Date: July 19, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
